AO 120 (Rev. 08/10)

TO:

Mail Stop 8

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Boy 1450

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been Western District of Texas, Austin Division on the following filed in the U.S. District Court ✓ Patents. (
☐ the patent action involves 35 U.S.C. § 292.): Trademarks or U.S. DISTRICT COURT DATE FILED 3/30/2011 Western District of Texas, Austin Division DOCKET NO. 1:11-cv-00251 SS DEFENDANT PLAINTIFF Immervision Grandeye Limited DATE OF PATENT HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK PATENT OR OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. 1 See attached

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s)/ trademark(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED

INCLUDED BY
Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading

PATENT OR TRADEMARK HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK

I

2

3

4

5	*		
	In the abov	e-entitled case, the following dec	cision has been rendered or judgement issued:
DECISION/I			her Order of Dismissal

	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	8 2011
CLERK		
William G. Putnicki	16 any Kourna	
	1	

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 3—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Director Copy 4—Case file copy

Case No: 1:11cv251 Filed: 09/08/11
Doc. #18

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FILED FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXASEP -8 AM 9: 20 AUSTIN DIVISION

BY LESS AND THE TEXA

GRANDEYE LIMITED.

Plaintiff,

Case No. A-11-CA-251-SS

IMMERVISION,

Defendant.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

BE IT REMEMBERED on this day there was presented to the Court the Stipulation of Dismissal [#17] filed by the parties in the above-styled and numbered cause, and after consideration of the same, the Court enters the following orders:

IT IS ORDERED that the Stipulation of Dismissal [#17] is GRANTED in all respects and this lawsuit is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that all costs are adjudged against the party incurring same.

SIGNED this the 7th day of September 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE